



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,402	09/17/2003	Xin Xuc	SONY-26500	9325
28960 7590 01/26/2007 HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP 162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD SUNNYVALE, CA 94086			EXAMINER PRICE, NATHAN E	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 01/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/666,402

Applicant(s)

XUE ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan Price

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003 and 27 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119


- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/27/2006.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 83 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The IDS lists documents that were not considered because they are not properly identified. See 37 CFR 1.98.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1 – 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 lists elements of the network as a, b and b (as opposed to a, b and c, which is used in other claims). Claims 2 – 19 inherit this deficiency. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 14, 17 and 51 – 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2194

5. Claims 14 and 17 recite the limitation "the second network device" in line 1.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 18 introduces a second network device, but claims 14 and 17 are currently dependent on claim 1.

6. As to claims 51 – 65, claim 51 states that the first network device includes a filter and that filtered content is sent to the first network device. Furthermore, claims 54 and 57 specify that the filtering includes the middleware filter reading the metadata included in the content. It is not clear how the filtered content is sent to the first network device if the content is filtered based on the filter included in the first network device. Claims 54 and 57 are interpreted as filtering data based on information from a middleware filter corresponding to the first network device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1 – 18 and 20 – 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kloba et al. (US 6,341,316 B1; hereinafter Kloba).

Art Unit: 2194

8. As to claim 1, Kloba teaches a network of devices to filter synchronized data, the network of devices comprising:

a content server to store content [col. 8 lines 15 – 28; col. 12 lines 35 – 45];

a first network device [col. 8 lines 15 – 28; col. 12 lines 35 – 45]; and

a middleware filter coupled to the first network device and to the content server

such that during a data synchronization, content is received by the middleware filter from the content server according to the data synchronization and the middleware filter selectively sends the received content to the first network device [col. 5 lines 41 – 52; col. 14 lines 29 – 53; col. 20 lines 15 – 34].

9. As to claim 2, Kloba teaches the content sent by the content server includes metadata [Table 3; col. 6 lines 1 – 38; col. 15 lines 15 – 34].

10. As to claim 3, Kloba teaches the metadata includes a data type of the content [Table 3; col. 6 lines 1 – 38; col. 15 lines 15 – 34].

11. As to claim 4, Kloba teaches the middleware filter reads the metadata of the content received from the content server and sends the content to the first network device if the data type of the read metadata matches an authorized data type associated with the first network device [Table 3; col. 6 lines 1 – 38; col. 15 lines 15 – 34].

Art Unit: 2194

12. As to claim 5, Kloba teaches the middleware filter stores the authorized data type of the first network device [col. 4 line 66 – col. 5 line 6; col. 8 lines 31 – 37].

13. As to claim 6, Kloba teaches the metadata includes an authorized network device type [Table 3; col. 5 line 64 – col. 6 line 38].

14. As to claim 7, Kloba teaches the middleware filter reads the metadata of the content received from the content server and sends the content to the first network device if the authorized network device type of the read metadata matches a network device type associated with the first network device [Table 3; col. 5 line 64 – col. 6 line 38].

15. As to claim 8, Kloba teaches the middleware filter stores the network device type of the first network device [col. 4 line 66 – col. 5 line 6; col. 8 lines 31 – 37].

16. As to claim 9, Kloba teaches the metadata is added to the content by the content server [Fig. 1; col. 28 lines 20 – 22].

17. As to claim 10, Kloba teaches the metadata includes data synchronization information corresponding to the data synchronization [col. 22 lines 12 – 37].

Art Unit: 2194

18. As to claim 11, Kloba teaches a display coupled to the middleware filter to display the data synchronization information [col. 8 lines 55 – 60; col. 12 lines 59 – 60].

19. As to claim 12, Kloba teaches the data synchronization is a one-way data synchronization [col. 14 lines 46 – 53].

20. As to claim 13, Kloba teaches the data synchronization is a bi-directional data synchronization [col. 5 lines 35 – 40].

21. As to claim 14, Kloba teaches the second network device comprises a personal computer [col. 8 lines 15 – 28].

22. As to claim 15, Kloba teaches the first network device comprises a PDA [col. 10 lines 32 – 42].

23. As to claim 16, Kloba teaches the content server comprises a web server [col. 4 lines 54 – 58; col. 27 lines 12 – 24].

24. As to claim 17, Kloba teaches the second network device comprises a server [col. 5 lines 41 – 67; col. 6 lines 25 – 38; col. 14 lines 29 – 53].

Art Unit: 2194

25. As to claim 18, Kloba teaches a second network device coupled in between the content server and the first network device, wherein the second network device includes the middleware filter [col. 5 lines 41 – 52; col. 7 line 66 – col. 8 line 7].

26. As to claim 20, see the rejections of claims 1, 14, 15 and 18.

27. As to claims 21 – 33, see the rejections of claims 2 – 13 and 16.

28. As to claim 34, see the rejections of claims 1 and 18.

29. As to claims 35 – 50, see the rejections of claims 2 – 17.

30. As to claim 51, see the rejection of claim 1. Also, see Kloba column 5 lines 41 – 67 and column 20 lines 15 – 18.

31. Claims 54 and 57 are interpreted as filtering data based on information from a middleware filter corresponding to the first network device.

32. As to claims 52 – 65, see the rejections of claims 2 – 13, 15 and 16.

33. As to claims 66 – 78, 80 and 81, see the rejections of claims 1 – 13, 15 and 16.

Art Unit: 2194

34. As to claim 79, see the rejections of claims 14 and 18.

35. As to claim 82, see the rejections of claims 17 and 18.

36. As to claim 83, see the rejection of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

37. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloba (US 6,341,316 B1).

38. As to claim 19, Kloba at least implies the content server can include the middleware filter because Figure 36 shows the clients connected to the server without showing an external content provider. Furthermore, Kloba teaches the providers can include a server that provides content and is similar to the server 104 shown in Figure 1 [col. 12 lines 35 – 44]. Therefore, it is at least implied that the server in Figure 36 can also provide the content, making it obvious to have the content server include the middleware filter.

Conclusion

39. The prior art made of record on the P.T.O. 892 that has not been relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Careful consideration of the cited art is required prior to responding to this Office Action, see 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c).

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Price whose telephone number is (571) 272-4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am - 3:00pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER